

SECRET

Subject: Dr LEVYTSKY *Volodymyr*

Source: as usual *L. Mada, Kishinev*

Date: 24 Sep 1964

-i-

1. Subject returned by plane from KIEV on 14 Sep 1964 to NEW YORK from his 23 day trip to the Ukraine which he made together with two of his friends from the States : M and S. *Volodymyr* Their itinerary included KIEV, LVIV, IVANOFRANKIVSKYI, and one or two villages near the latter.

In KIEV Subject *spent* most of his time on discussions with GHOLYCH, LEVISHCHENKO, and *K* KOLOSOVA; and in LVIV with SPUPNYTSKYI, P (editor of Vilna Ukraina) WILDE, Irene (writer); GZEYTSKYI (writers, spent about 20 years in Siberia), MYHAL, Taras; and others.

2. Subject visited Source on 23 Sep 1964 (16.00 to 18.30 hrs).
Source
he brought a letter from LEVISHCHENKO (nothing of interest) and a present *china*
(small figure on Ukrainian kozak in shupan).

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCES METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2B
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2007

SECRET

24 Sept 64

SECRET

Subject told Source the following:

1. Rutgers University Affair.

While in Kiev Subject had a long discussion with SMOLYCH and LEVISHCHENKO about KOCHUBEY'S presentation at Rutgers Uni. The appraisal of this "affair" by LEVISHCHENKO and SMOLYCH was negative from their point of view "because Rutgers did them (Sovs) much more harm than good". Therefore, in the future they would have at least second thoughts about such arrangements. When Subject pressed the opposite view and tried to convince them that precisely such arrangements were in their direct interest and they should not accuse them, LEVISHCHENKO and SMOLYCH replied that "Subject ^{was} wrong because they (in Kiev) are not able to control such discussions!" "This happened to KOCHUBEY and moreover so after his speech when he was so much confused by students. Then the whole affair went completely out of hand!" "Therefore even Subject's suggestion to introduce on such occasions questions only on paper was in their opinion of no use!" Subject -- referring to their attitude -- complained again that they (in Kiev) don't understand emigre-problems and don't want to learn anything from people like Subject.

2. "Build-up of STEPISHKO"

Another topic widely discussed by Subject with SMOLYCH and LEVISHCHENKO was the current attack of Soviet propaganda incl. Khrushchev himself against Mr STEPISHKO and his group. Subject asked them for what purpose was it all being done and pointed out that by such attacks they (Sovs) do only strengthen the position of STEPISHKO and his group. As an example he gave them some excerpts from emigree - ~~press~~ and foreign press and expressed quite a strong critique of such tactics. Instead of attacks like those of Khrushchev and others in connection with Stockholm Subject recommended them to publish articles and letters like

~~SECRET~~

those by KUK and MATVIYENKO. In the beginning LEVISHCHENKO and SMOLYCH tried to refute his arguments but ^{then} they simply said, "we are advised to do so and we cannot change it". When Subject wanted to know who was "so stupidly" advising them they just repeated again "we can't change it". Subject's impression was that they were referring to some higher authorities.

3. "Rivalry" between SMOLYCH and KOLOSOVA.

Without elaborating on it Subject told Source that as far he could notice there was some sort of rivalry between KOLOSOVA and her organization on the one hand and SMOLYCH with LEVISHCHENKO on the other.

4. Ukrainian Soviet Delegation to the States ~~and~~ Canada.

Kiev plans to send in the first half of October 1964 its delegation to both countries. In NEW YORK they hope to arrive in mid-October and will stay here for 5 days. The Delegation will consist of :

LEVISHCHENKO,
KOLOSOVA,
KOZAK (conductor from Lviv)
KASTYAN, Vasil (Kiev, graphic, painter)
VILDE, Irene (Lviv - writer)
MAIBORODA, Platon (Kiev, composer)
PAVLYCHKO, Dmytro (Lviv, poet)

and 2 poets or writers ~~plus~~ plus a singer (Subject forgot their names). LEVISHCHENKO wants to see SOURCE and discuss with her many problems. They are interested as before in meeting someone from press, cultural and other fields.

Subject criticized them (SMOLYCH and LEVISHCHENKO) for making too much noise with their arrival and pointed out that "banderivtsi" might start writing letters to the White House and to the Congress against granting the delegation visas. Since this is an election year "banderivtsi" might foil the whole matter. SMOLYCH replied that he (Subject) might be right but now it was too late and they hoped to come anyway.

~~SECRET~~

5. VIRSKYI'S ENSEMBLE

Fall or winter 1964 they will perform in South America. He did not know in what countries exactly. They will be staying there for 6 months. In 1966 they should come to the States and will present " West Ukrainian Wedding".

Subject was present at one or two rehearsals, spoke to VIRSKYI, and thought "The West Ukrainian Wedding" was really good.

6. The Arson in the Library

Subject was told by KOLOSOVA and SMOLYCH that the incendiary was an employee who had been at that time released from his job. Out of vengeance he put some powder into individual departments and put them on fire. The damage is serious but not all is lost. Hetman-period and other historical documents were not damaged. Some works and documents of Ukrainian classicists, mainly by HEINCHENKO and his generation were burned down completely.

7. New Regulations for Inturist

When Subject complained that current touristic policy of Inturist was out of date and inefficient pointing out that it was too expensive, too limited in territorial and organizational scope also, SMOLYCH told him that recently they were giving new regulations to Inturist which should be more conducive to expanding the tourist traffic of emigration. Thus, Inturist will organize now open - individual and group - tours with flexible itinerary, at reduced prices, and with some other extra privileges.

Subject mentioned to them Source that would never go on a regular tourist trip and HUNCHAK, Taras of Rutgers Uni who in Subject's opinion should be also invited to Kiev and given all facilities.

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

8. SHUMEIKO and SHIPKA Agencies

KOLOSOVA criticized very strongly trips arranged by SHUMEIKO, Vira. According to her SHUMEIKO'S groups were indoctrinated by her, biased, and behaved contrary to guests' regulations.

KOLOSOVA expressed positive opinion about SHIPKA'S Agency of Chicago, Ill.

The group organized by SHIPKA was objective and could see everything.

Inturist did not even mind that they sneaked out by taxis into countryside.

Subject defended SHUMEIKO but he was not sure whether this helped her much. He was afraid that they might "forbid" Shumeiko to send any groups to the Ukraine in the future.

9. STASIUK'S Soil in Museum.

Subject saw at Shevchenko Museum in Kiev the soil brought back recently by STASIUK. It is exhibited together with Stasiuk's declaration against the Shevchenko Committee headed by Prof Smal-Stotskyi in the States.

10. General situation

In spite of Russification Subject was very optimistic about its final failure and in some recent developments saw the proof for that.

In his opinion there were ^{already} some improvements, and ~~perhaps~~ some strong portents for the better in the future. Among them:

a/ Students and youth in Kiev, Lviv and other cities ~~are~~ absolutely patriotic. They have great interest in Ukrainian history, culture, and their resistance against Russian acculturation in recent years remarkably has increased.

b/ Seemingly ubiquitous usage of Russian in cities is misleading as to its real ~~meaning~~ meaning. Some Ukrainians who might use Russian are at the same time proud of their Ukrainian nationality and in using Russian don't

~~SECRET~~

^a see ~~betrayal~~ of their nation. Subject mentioned the following example:

during Shevchenko-concert in Kiev in 1964 a Georgian spoke in Ukrainian.

The hall ^{received} ~~accepted~~ his speech with such ^{tremendous} ~~a~~ applause that no one had before.

And Subject was sure that probably a good portion of the public spoke Russian.

He added that at the concert was also a high ^{Russian} ~~official~~ ~~from~~ as guest and he commented that "Georgians are nationalists anyway and that's probably why he got such an applause".

c/ In recent years students and young intelligentsia in general began to sing carols in the public, in both Kiev and Lviv. In Subject's opinion this was not as much an expression of religious feelings but rather of national consciousness.

d/ General interest in politics among young people is much greater in the Ukraine than abroad. Subject's picture was printed in "Vilna Ukraina". Many young people ^{in Lviv} ~~referring to it~~ addressed Subject in the streets and wanted to discuss with him various political problems.

e/ There are plans to increase Ukrainian classic publications like works by Kotsiubynskyi and others. Shevchenko's prose has been already published. ^a There is also ^a tendency to give more freedom of research for Ukrainian humanists. Thus, KRYPIAKOVYCH, Ivan got now access to all sources he wanted to and is ~~unrestricted~~ in his scientific research.

f/ Names of cities on ~~new~~ mail-stamps are being put now more and more in Ukrainian beside Russian. Hotel "Dnipro" has "everything" (menu cards etc) in Ukrainian and foreign languages. Subject thought that mail-stamps, new publications, also were ^a to ^{to be} great extent at least ~~ascribed~~ to him and his colleagues who for years kept criticizing official people in Kiev for their stupid policy of Russification. In his opinion, one could achieve much more by "a positive critique" than by "super-patriotic" attacks.

g/ Subject noticed some shortages in food supplies but no critical situation. Queues were to be seen as usual, bread was mixed with peas and maize but not too bad. In Moscow one could get everything.

Subject met in ~~KIV~~^E and then in LVIV sister -in-law of late Prof LYTWYNENKO of New York. She is an actress with Lviv-Theatre, at that time stayed in Caucasus.

Her husband is from Carpatho-Ukraine. Her maiden name is DZIMOVYCH.

actress
The ~~actor~~ complained about food-shortages, and particularly lack of good textiles, and other consumer goods. Also about worsening situation in general. Subject did not specify.

11. Miscellaneous.

a/ It is not evident yet who will take the place of late MYLSKYI in the image of the people.

b/ Subject brought for STASIUK pictures of Shevchenko-sculpture by Honchar of Kiev which STASIUK will print in his book in order to show that MOLODOZHANYN (author of Shevchenko's monument in Washington, D.C.) has "imitated" HONCHAR I.M.

c/ SMOLYCH and LEVISHCHENKO are of a very high opinion about Source. They know they cannot make a communist out of her but as well she cannot make nationalists out of them. What they appreciate is her courage and the fact that one can talk to her objectively, in spite of ideological differences. Source will get a real VIP treatment on her trip to the Ukraine.

d/ SMOLYCH and LEVISHCHENKO mentioned the ~~answer~~ answer-letter of 62 from New York. What they particularly liked were passages about peace and condemnation of nuclear war. They expressed however their surprise and indignation at how people like SAMCHUK, Ulas were asked to sign it.

e/ Subject did not meet yet SHEVCHENKO, Sergei, the head of Ukrainian Mission in New York. According to what he was ^{told} in Kiev, SHEVCHENKO is

a rather fat, middleaged, softspoken, quiet man . subject did not say anything about his previous career.